

Draft Analysis Team Minutes 02/10/2004

INTRODUCTION AND PAST MINUTES: Chairman John Sullivan convened the meeting at 8:05 am. After introductory remarks he distributed minutes and a summary of the January 6, 2004 conference call. Adoption of these minutes was deferred until members have a chance to review them.

Sullivan reviewed background information for this meeting. UMESC distributed budget numbers in an e-mail message from Pat Heglund, and John Sullivan made bar charts and pie charts to summarize these numbers. John Chick sent out an e-mail summarizing Team Leaders' analysis of the budget on February 4, 2004. Marvin Hubbell also sent out general e-mail and attached documents (related to the Status and Trends Report) February 4 which the A-Team received February 9.

BUDGET UPDATE: Roger Perk updated budget information. The 2004 budget has taken some hits and the USACE budget overall was tight. Savings and Slippage was 22%, plus an additional 0.7% rescission due to expenses overseas. Perk said they are making tough choices with shortfalls on both HREP and LTRM sides of EMP. EMPCC at their last meeting made the decision they were not going to transfer any money from LTRM to HREP, and we all need to work within our budget. We need to work together to come up with a plan to implement LTRMP for 2004, and then we can start working on 2005. In 2005 the President's budget is \$28 million—last year it was \$33 million. Perk suggested we look at \$19 million for 2005. We'll work hard with Congress, but Perk was not overly optimistic. It is easier to go up than down, he added. Congress seems to be at \$19 million most consistently. The FY 2004 final savings and slippage plus rescission was 22.7%. Linda Leake will provide more detail at this meeting.

Janet Sternburg asked to have Savings and Slippage (S&S) clarified. Perk explained that in conference committee the House and Senate agree on line items that they want to get done. If the total of all line items in the Energy and Water appropriation ends up higher than the bottom line number, savings and slippage is taken out. If a project ends up in the language of the bill, they are prioritized as line items and don't have Savings & Slippage taken out. It is very difficult to get an appropriation as a line item—typically someone on the committee must strongly support it and push it through. Once it is set to a specific amount as a line item, the receiving agency can't move the money around, so it also limits flexibility. There is a different S&S for each one of the appropriations—it depends on how many line items in each are set out for each year. Janet Sternburg asked if it was a possibility to get it set aside. Perk explained there has to be money to give back to the project to get it set aside. Lately there is very little such money, and very little chance. John Sullivan asked where EMP fits in terms of the Corps funding distribution. Perk explained there are 3 different appropriations—O&M (Operation and Maintenance), CG (Construction General), and GI (General Investigations). S&S is lower for some of those. John Sullivan commented that EMP is a management activity dealing with environmental construction on the river. It should be treated equally with O&M. Perk explained that congressionally they are 2 different pieces—different appropriations. In O&M they draw a cut line and say these things aren't going to happen. Sullivan made

the point we have an environmental side trying to maintain the balance. That's where there is concern.

Chuck Theiling commented there is wisdom to keeping it separate, because if O&M and EMP are together in one appropriation, O&M will get money first for navigation, and there is a risk of not getting it for the environment.

SCOPE OF WORK (SOW): Linda Leake detailed changes in funding since the last reduction (a 0.7% rescission). The new number for the appropriated LTRMP is \$4.39 million. In the e-mail to A-team, banked dollars are those remaining in Coop agreements with states and USGS, and these total \$193 K. The new bottom line with the banked dollars is \$4.59 million. Last year, the total program was 3.9 million and in FY2002 it was \$5.2 million. The starting assumptions were that all Permanent staff would be retained, and no Field Stations (FS) closed, and then taking technical guidance from the FY03 A-team priorities and discussion with FS and Principle Investigators (PI's) trying to hear priorities within the program. When they put it together, the target was trying to get back to the FY02 sampling. A couple things had to happen, however—they had to go through FS and UMESC and eliminate temporary staff within the program and also reduce operating expenses. It was tough, and while they were doing that, they used the chart with staffing patterns [sampling schedules] blocked in for field collections as another tool to help put that SOW together. The bottom line they arrived at was a \$4.66 million suggested SOW. It takes more money than we have, Leake explained, and in Iowa, there were also budget salary errors. Iowa could not find any efficiency to cover that, so the suggested SOW is now \$68K in the red. In addition there is the 0.7% rescission of \$27K, so we end up with \$4.398 million as the money available. Several things are going on. This brings us to a common starting spot.

Linda Ott explained the facilities and common services charges which stem from new business practices government-wide. The guidance given by USGS was to go back to the FY02 budget and determine how much administrative support and common services were taken at a Bureau level of 16% in FY02 and 11% in FY 04. In FY02 it was \$964K, and in 04, \$867K. "Facilities" is defined as your rent line item. Everything else is common services—postage, copy machines, telephones, etc. Another point was that COE has been concerned about this from the beginning of this program's time and wanted more clarification with the new process. The bottom line after these discussions was that COE and USGS have agreed now and they have a clear understanding of common business practices and no further discussion was needed.

"Do common services include FS indirect?" Chuck Theiling asked. "Yes," Linda Ott replied, "It varies among partners."

John Chick asked how it could be that it was \$4.25 million originally, then \$4.398, and now \$68K in the hole. Linda Leake explained why it didn't add up—the budget Bellevue submitted was an additional FS charge. "At this point in time we're in the hole," Linda Leake said. Linda Ott also did an assessment of UMESC common services in facilities by FS and USGS. UMESC is right in the middle, between FS. Linda Leake summarized

that the way the information is packaged has changed. The Onalaska FS is in UMESC's facility rate. Linda Ott also explained that once the move is done, there will be a reduction on the facility rate for next year, but did not have an exact amount estimated.

Janet Sternburg asked if they were pro-rating facilities and common charges for all the various programs at UMESC. "It is prorated based on labor," Linda Ott explained.

John Sullivan received e-mail along with everyone else that laid out what Team Leaders are asking for. The bottom line of their evaluation was that there appeared to be sufficient money to carry out the 2002 work (the field effort). "Why does field effort have to be curtailed if there is sufficient money to carry out the work?" Sullivan asked. "There seems to be a disconnect," he added.

John Chick explained the process team leaders went through. They asked the question, "How far off are we from having enough to complete 02 work? UMESC's total for the FS to do the work was 2.671. The Team leaders found one mistake with Missouri's budget that they adjusted for and came up with a total of 2.610 million. Linda Ott explained there were nuances in the budget, which actually now totals 2.7614—in that figure there is \$107K for contract work for Heidi Langrehr, Andy Bartels, and Jim Fischer at the Onalaska FS for additional support to the UMESC component specialists. Initially for that, they needed to take out approx 105K from the UMESC number. They also had to take a 10% operations cut across the board and leave a pool of money \$33.7K for temporary help for FS. FS could not be fully funded at level requested of Tom Kelly. FS budgets submitted in the fall were never able to be funded at that level. Linda Leake said when they got their bottom line number, following the not closing any FS assumption, they had to reduce operating expenses and cut temporary staff, and they were still \$68K in the red. We can't fund the budget at the level we submitted. JOHN SULLIVAN added, "Essentially the \$100K issue with Terry's FS, means the program is \$168K short with 02 level."

Linda Leake said yesterday they looked at the suggested SOW—what would it take to bring us back to 02 sampling level, and it would take \$175 K in order for FS to sample at 2002 level. "As Roger mentioned," she said, "the Corps has been looking but has not been successful in finding the additional funds. That's our priority too, but because of the budget constraints, we can't get there. How can we modify the suggested SOW to get to the budget we need to have?"

Linda Leake explained that within UMESC, we've been able to work with Terry to contract with them to provide some minimal services. This is not because of a budget issue Terry has, it's just because got included in FS column at UMESC but not in the FS total for baseline monitoring. It was in FS side at UMESC to save money. Chuck asked Terry what she had budgeted for. "Not full cost," Terry replied. She did not account for the contract money in the baseline budget. "When I know how much we're getting for the contract work, I will be adjusting appropriately for this year," she said.

Roger Perk asked, “How are we determining how many things are getting done in a given year? When we’re putting dollars to certain tasks, is there some flexibility or is there slop in there? Who’s not getting the temporary help to get the field work done?”

Someone (who?) said that from the Team Leaders’ perspective—we have no idea how it will be broken down to our level—\$33K for temp help—pool determined based on our recommendations for suggested SOW. Temps were based on what Team Leaders felt they need to execute a full 02 sampling.

Roger Perk asked the Team Leaders, “If you had bottom line #, is it possible you could do more than what was in your initial budget that you put in? Next step is what can you accomplish for that many dollars for your stretch of the river? Am I hearing we might be closer than we think we are? Is that what I’m hearing?”

John Sullivan reminded the group that this is not clear for the lab work with water quality—we don’t know if they can cover SRS. Barry said \$175 includes enough for full sampling load for all parameters in 02. \$30K is the amount in the \$175 that covers lab. If we want reduced parameters, we can reduce that total of \$30K somewhat. John Sullivan stated there was a concern that lab cost was driving the field work. “It’s my feeling you still have valuable information to collect, even without the chemistry lab,” he said. “We could still do the field work and not incur a lot of cost at the lab end.”

Barry Johnson stated we might have to cut SRS in spring—it depends on what the total number ends up at.

John Sullivan said, “We have to have the discussion of what field work needs to get carried out.”

Someone offered clarification-- The \$175K deficit includes temporary help at FS, operating costs across the board, and the shortfall from Bellevue. The bottom line is that the LTRMP is \$68K in red right now.

Chuck Theiling said “It appears to be boiling down to the loss of a temp to each FS. How do you make up for the loss of that one body to get the work done?”

Linda Leake explained that it’s not that simple because if each FS comes up with a different strategy, how does that affect program as a whole? “We all agree we don’t want each FS going independently,” she concluded.

Janet Sternberg asked, “Are there other components of the budget you can defer to another year and put that towards more monitoring? We’re looking at efficiencies on the monitoring side to do more work. Is there opportunity to look at that on the federal side?”

Linda Leake said, “Yes—we’ve done that and cut half of students in GIS—there is some potential where products could be delayed. One of the nuances is that to reassign highly paid technical folks, there are additional costs—travel and per diem.”

John Sullivan said, “Assign higher priorities to some tasks. Could there be temporary assignment of permanent staff to carry out some lab work?”

Linda Leake replied that in most areas a single person isn’t owned by LTRMP—it’s only a % of their time.

Marvin Hubbell said, “This has been informative-this group needs to stipulate so much money we’re short and start planning. In the absence of having a good idea of what we’re buying, we all want to maintain status quo as close as we can to 2002—we’re getting close to chasing our tails here.

John Sullivan agreed and stated the group has better understanding on how money is distributed to FS. “Apparently temporary help at FS was critical for carrying out all field work in FY02, he said. “There may be savings on UMESC side as well. The job of A-Team is giving a recommendation of where our priorities are for the long term program. The States that commented recognize we all want to do 2002 level monitoring, but we can’t always due to budget fluctuations. We think that baseline 02 is priority, but we have to consider permanent staff and assigning effort.”

Discussions of specifics of how to accomplish this ensued. Different states had different ideas and priorities. For example, IL was concerned about losing 1st period of fish sampling and WI was more concerned about losing water quality or vegetation data in the program

John Sullivan said, “The real question is what can we afford not to do this year?” There is consensus we have a problem, but we’re not certain what the full design should be. The A-Team needs to come up with guidance on general feeling of what we can afford to loose.”

The Analysis Team took a break, and after the break, John Sullivan asked, “Does anyone disagree that we don’t have a shortfall?” There were no disagreements.

There have been suggestions about how to reduce shortfall—it’s a 4% across the board reduction at each FS and at UMESC,” Sullivan clarified. “The number is \$175K. The Army Corps could cut 1% and then UMESC and FS each could cut 1%. That’s one alternative to reach the 02 effort.”

Roger Perk explained that the HREP side is already \$0.5 million short. “We are going to work within our budgets. For the \$68 K, let’s deal with it. No, the Corps won’t move 1% on the HREP,” Perk concluded. John Sullivan added that at the last EMPCC meeting EMPCC already made that decision. Sullivan also suggested the group pass along some comment in terms of how we might better address the issue of Savings and Slippage.

“Our recommendations are for FY 2004, not for the out years at this time,” Janet Sternburg clarified. “If everyone cuts by 4%, that might still mean we have to cut effort in the field. Do FS believe they could do full monitoring with an additional 4% cut?”

Valerie Barko commented that she was troubled about basing cuts on budget rather than science.

JOHN SULLIVAN stated. “That’s an important point—the A-Team is asked to make suggestions, but we don’t always have all the information available to do that. The work we went through the fisheries program is very valuable looking closely at it. For the future, Valerie hit it right on the head. We should plan for the fluctuating budget and what the program will be in those years when we don’t have the money.”

Janet Sternberg reminded the group that visions for the future will be discussed at EMPCC.

“Are there places all across the program where there can be cuts?” John Sullivan asked. “I don’t think we should look at this as entirely attacking one side or the other. We have to have a philosophy to look at all of it.”

John Chick asked, “Is it a worthwhile exercise to look at the federal side of the budget?”

Chuck Theiling asked about apparent inefficiencies in data management and what data management includes. Linda Leake answered that it includes managing and processing the data, taking care of computers in field, maintaining the database, taking care of the website, and query tools. “Those are permanent folks and there is no more money to gain,” she said, adding she went through and made at least 4 cuts already. “We’re almost at the point that if you cut it anymore, it’s not worthwhile doing,” she said. “At what point can we not do it? We need opportunity to go back and look at it.”

Janet Sternburg commented, “It’s a lot of loss in staff and that’s reality.”

John Chick commented that the way we’ve been reducing our budget is by gaining efficiencies. At a 4% level, that’s not a long term solution—you rob Peter to pay Paul.

Barry Johnson added that we’re halfway through the year and some sampling has already not been done—“to start a year and do full sampling will cost a lot more than it does now at this point.”

University salaries are all in contract and cannot be cut, Linda Ott said. Students and temps that haven’t yet been brought on board are the ones that are potential cuts.

Pat Heglund said, “You’re asking for a lot of scientific information to back up what work we chose to do and that’s not a whole lot of money to do the work.”

UMESC staff identified some possible additional cuts such as 2 students doing LCU, Reducing a parameter set or taking only field WQ measurements, and cutting the \$11K identified for high priority emergency equipment refreshment.

John Sullivan asked, “Where can you save money to get the 4% cut in field station level?”

There was discussion that first period fish sampling is not even in the scope and would need to be added back to do the full 2002 fish sampling. Should we just leave it out instead? Rob Maher said Illinois had heartburn about that because fish has already been looked at. IL from science standpoint doesn’t think dropping a whole period of fish is valid. Missouri also said they don’t have a vegetation component to drop, which limits choices more for their field station.

Chuck Theiling asked, “What if we ramped up Water Quality monitoring to the 2002 level, but reduced the parameter’s list? If we conduct 02 field effort for WQ, what effort will we do in the lab?”

Currently, TN, TP, SS, CHLA, volatile SS is a very weak effort in the lab, John Sullivan answered. “If we run into a situation we have not seen, we will miss opportunity of looking at that aspect—such was drought, which we suspect is what affected vegetation and nutrient levels in the crash in the early 1990’s. We’re missing important component, and I don’t know the costs of getting soluble Nitrogen, etc back on line.”

Rob Mayer suggested the A-Team come up with a prioritized list for out years.

Chuck Theiling asked about vegetation component salaries on the UMESC side listed at 1.4 FTE’s. The .4 is Barry Johnson, Jim Rogala, and Brian Ickes.

Jenny Sauer asked for clarification –“10 % has already taken off FS budgets. What are we taking the 4% off of?” Barry Johnson and John Chick (?) clarified that the 4% has to come off accounts to the make up for the \$175K the program is short.

Someone asked how are the 5 field stations (all except Onalaska) saying it is possible to do the full monitoring with an additional 4% reduction? Missouri stated they can make up dollar amounts by piggy-backing time between the various projects. John Chick said he would not fill a permanent position and would hire a temp instead. Mark Pegg said he would be ok as long as equipment doesn’t fail. Walt Popp said he can cut \$9K from a planned airboat repair. Mike Steuck said he would cut amount of temp staff time and cut one out because of doing EMAP. Mark Pegg said results would be slower because they might not have as much time for analyses later. John Chick said there are unspoken risks—“if a couple things go wrong for us—we’ll all be in the red. There are no surpluses expenditures to make it up. John Sullivan asked if that happened, “Would fall or summer work be cut?”

Linda Leake commented that we are fiscally irresponsible if we have to go in red.

Marvin Hubbell asked if UMESC could then support that. Linda Leake answered that “until we take a look at it, we’re not going to say, but trying to get to a 4% cut will impact others.”

Much discussion ensued about the risks of dropping various types of monitoring and lab parameters. “We’re asking for priorities,” Barry Johnson stated and asked each state rep to for the state’s priorities for field work:

Missouri ranked as follows from highest to lowest: 1. Fish (has been evaluated) 2. Water Quality (summer and fall are highest priority times), 3. Macroinvertebrates, 4. Vegetation, and keep the status and trends report for justifying future full funding. Reduce travel, delay presentations, and eliminate science planning in 2004 unless it can be accountable to a non-LTRMP funding source. Further reduce LCU, bathymetry, and website products.

Illinois ranked from highest to lowest: 1. Fish, 2. Vegetation, 3. Water Quality (WQ could do without winter sampling, however they stated.)

Iowa ranked from highest to lowest as follows: 1. Fish, 2. Water Quality, 3. Invertebrates, 4. Vegetation. They said summer and fall were the most important sampling times for fish.

Wisconsin-John Sullivan polled all members and ranked from highest to lowest as follows: 1. Vegetation, 2. Water Quality and Fish ranked together as similar, 3. Invertebrates was least important. We could live with a reduced parameter list at lab from 2002, with priorities in water quality as follows: 1. MC fixed 2. Tributary fixed, and 3. off channel fixed sites lower priority. For WQ SRS, from most important to least important 1. Winter, 2. Summer, 3. Fall, 4. Spring. Inverts ranked lowest because of quite a bit of variation—we would like to hear thoughts of where it should go in future. We agree with what IA and MO already said for UMESC side. WI agrees that the Status and Trends Report should be kept as suggested.

Minnesota ranked from components from highest to lowest priority as follows: 1. Water Quality, 2. Vegetation, 3. Fish, 4. Inverts. For water quality SRS, winter and summer SRS most important and retain the fixed sites. They would like John Sullivan’s compromise for retaining dissolved nutrients like SRP, etc. MN has collects a lot of fish on Pool 4 –this is a state perspective, not a program perspective. Vegetation is important all the way around and for looking at effects of more drawdowns and more water level management. They did not have an opinion on the Status and Trends report yet.

EPA said Inverts ranked lowest, and that Fish and Water Quality should go across the board. Vegetation is important in the part of the river where grows. In the lower end

vegetation is not as important. From lowest to highest priority (1 is highest), Inverts 4, vegetation 3, water quality 2, fish 1(because it has been assessed already and trimmed).

Fish and Wildlife Service's representative commented that system wide there are different answers. There should be component evaluation that asks, "In this pool or stretch of the river what benefit do we get for the effort expended? Zero me out for this 04 exercise".

Barry Johnson and Pat Heglund reminded the group UMESC has already done some of the looking at different Components in different parts of river and Pat Heglund mentioned that in the cluster analysis for vegetation, some of the upper pools were much more similar than the lower pools.

The Army Corps Of Engineers – ranked fish 1 vegetation 2 Water Quality 3 inverts 4. Chuck Theiling said he did that on the basis on their ability to detect changes from HREPS. "From a fish perspective we hope someday down the road we'll be able to see poolwide responses, especially in Pool 8 when all the islands are constructed."

USGS-Pat Heglund and Barry Johnson stated that their FY04 proposal was what they felt was program wide was most appropriate. John Sullivan commented that effort now appeared consistent with what some of the differences are between field stations. "It was not a random effort on our part to decide who does what."

Tom Boland (IA) commented that, "I can be swayed differently if more information comes to light."

John Sullivan said the ranking gives us some feel for what to do this year and summarized. He asked the Team Leaders to send their 4% reductions and comments directly to UMESC and Linda Leake said they would need that and an impact list "yet this week", and UMESC would do the same. They would send it to John and John would copy it to the other A-team members, allowing them a couple days to return any comments.

Barry Johnson said that in WQ everyone indicated they can live with current parameters plus dissolved nutrients-dissolved nitrates, P, and silica, ammonia if possible, if it's not too expensive.

Fish—everyone agreed we should do all gears all periods if we can. WIS and MN said if push comes to shove they are willing to live with reduction in spring fish work.

VISIONS FOR FUTURE LTRMP

Based on what the program has been getting from Congress, what flexibility can we build into this program for the future? Pat Heglund and Marvin Hubbell will be discussing planning for a limited-funded LTRMP at EMPCC's next meeting. The purpose of this discussion is to inform the A-Team and provide some initial feedback for the EMPCC.

Marvin said at this point in time, they don't have a lot to report, but have been trying to figure out how they might get to what they might do in the future. They are hoping to have some kind of tentative recommendation at the May EMPCC meeting. They are anticipating by the August meeting 2004 at the latest a plan is agreed upon. They have not discussed how they will gain the input for what it should look like. Have been discussing identification of stakeholders, surveys, etc. For this discussion focus on outcomes from A-Team perspective—1) users, what information they use and want, etc, and 2) tools to get there. Preserving the current level of knowledge will be a critical component of it. There is also a need to identify expectations for the abilities to detect change. There are not many answers beyond these starting points. The 3 people—Pat, Richie (?lastname?) (USFWS) and Marvin have not met together yet.

John Sullivan asked, “Will this involve a potential restructuring of the program for fiscal management?”

Marvin Hubbell stated that during that discussion he didn't think there were limits put on the parameters to consider. That means we should asking administrative changes too.

John Sullivan asked, “Do you anticipate changes for the legislation?”

Marvin Hubbell replied that if there are legal constraints, there is not enough time to get it in the Report to Congress—“If there is a constraint, it would be in legal authorities.”

John Sullivan—“Is there the potential that field stations could be funded differently and that would save program money?”

Marvin said, “In fairness we ought to ask that question of any part of the program. I don't know that the legislation specifically says all 31.4% of \$ needs to go through Interior.”

John Sullivan said he had heard many questions and comments about it and felt it needed to be brought forward. “I think there's been enough concern that it should be addressed as part of the review.”

Tom Boland asked, “Who's going to be doing the looking at Visions for the Future? The Corps? Leslie?”

Marvin replied, “We need to look at that—if there's a vision statement already adopted, that should be used as a starting point.”

Tom Boland said, “There's not much money out there—this conversation needs to start and all the partners need to be part of, not just USGS and the Corps.” (Marvin agreed.) Boland went on, “Just like we do a review of the science, we need to take a look at the administrative side. It needs to be done soon, hopefully within the next year, so we don't get caught in this situation. We've done everything you're talking about—we need to do it again.”

Marvin Hubbell replied, “Yes, to the extent that we all agree on what’s still important.”

Tom Boland said, “I hate to think of a scenario where the administration is just accepting budget cuts.”

Marvin Hubbell said, “In addition to those discussions we have other things such as the IL River initiative and the navigation study. If the nav study goes through, there is a monitoring component that goes with that. How do we position LTRM to work in concert if one of those 2 programs becomes a reality?”

Tom Boland said, “It needs to be done and I’d be willing to be involved in that.”

John Sullivan asked, “From the science side, will we have reports and associated recommendations to help you and others decide what’s important? What will we have in a month?”

Marvin Hubbell replied, “Three of 10-yr reports are in draft, with a 4th coming. I’m anticipating relevant knowledge is there-I may be making a false assumption, but I’m hoping as we go through, we’ll see progress on all those assumptions.”

Chuck Theiling asked, “How is the EMP program review that is supposed to be happening working into this recommendation? We’ll have that and outcomes of WRDA 04 and then can enter into more comprehensive reorganization. Meanwhile it’s limited, but if we put it off for 9 months, we can be planning for realities.”

More discussion ensued between Theiling and Hubbell about planning options.

Pat Heglund said, “If everyone just stays available as we go through this process to give feedback that will be important.”

John Sullivan asked, “Are you willing to retain Tom [Boland] as an additional worker?”

Pat Heglund said she would take it under advisement with Leslie and Richard. Marvin Hubbell asked if the A-Team had others to volunteer from field stations, etc. John Sullivan replied that he would support Tom Boland doing it.

Marvin Hubbell said there is nothing formal at this time-he and Pat and Richard are a subgroup responding to direction given by EMPCC—it’s just Leslie and Roger’s effort to respond to that. If there is a working group identified, bring names back to Leslie and Roger.

John Sullivan added a general comment that “I think it would be advantageous for the A-Team to have some information on the budget, so we can raise any concerns and questions early enough to be addressed rather than waiting.” Hubbell assured him they

would think early about the actual number minus anticipated S&S. John Sullivan asked for other comments.

Pete Redmon (USEPA) said, “I’d like to see serious consideration for all potential users. It’s important to build a strong, broad base with a bigger variety of activity. It’s important those bases are all covered. Water Quality monitoring on the river hasn’t been a big deal except in the two northern states.” John Sullivan added that “it’s not just members around this room—other agencies have a stake in what is going forward on this river.”

STATUS OF 10-YEAR LTRMP REPORTS

Barry Johnson reported that drafts have been turned in for fish, invertebrate, and vegetation components. The Water Quality 10-yr report is lagging a bit, he said and added that Jim Fischer (WDNR) “did a very admirable job for us, but it was more work than he and the rest of the group could accomplish. Jeff Houser came on this fall and it is his top priority to finish this report. The Field Station authors are putting drafts together and Jeff is doing coordination. A draft is due by March 15th.

If people have questions or comments on the draft reports handed out today, Barry would like the comments back through John Sullivan within 3 weeks time. If that’s not possible, they’ll make other arrangements, he said. John said he’d take care of compiling comments on the Water Quality and Vegetation side. He asked for a volunteer to provide feedback to ATEAM for fish and invertebrate reports and to compile comments. Kevin Stauffer volunteered for fish. Invertebrates is open for someone to come forward. Jennie Sauer appreciates our ability to come through with this. Also, Jennie Sauer said an e-mail on the web-based reports just went out—there were 4 Vegetation reports and one 1 Invertebrate report. “It’s an excellent product,” she said, explaining that a person could go in on website and do a trend. Yao Yin and Heidi Langrehr summarized the vegetation data through 2003—it’s web-based and in a format that is easy to extract. We need to have you look at it and make certain they get your comments,” she told the group.

Chuck Theiling asked Barry Johnson what we can expect in terms of analysis reports. He replied that for Fish there are 3 other reports—two on community ecology from a systemic and a local perspective and the other one is the autoecology group’s report which analyzes spatial and temporal variance composition. These are in the 2nd round or review before being sent out to peer-reviewed journals. Chuck Theiling commented that he had assumed the articles would have an LTRMP cover, “Am I wrong? He asked. Barry replied that any publications will indicate it was done through LTRMP funding. There are no specific LTRMP publications planned for the extra reports. Brian Ickes said that LTRM series tech reports will have a number of the points, and then manuscripts will be developed from them. The technical report typically comes before the peer-reviewed article. Pat Heglund mentioned that she still has concerns about journal scrutiny—whether a journal would consider such manuscripts as bonafide, unique contributions. She added the trend is for more and more restrictiveness about how different they need to be from the content of the technical report.

John Sullivan said it sounds like we'll get this information one way or the other—the timing is important—how valuable is it to have it now? Pat said none [journal editors] yet are giving them problems. Contracts are more specific now, however. Barry Johnson estimated a month to two months before the manuscripts go to journals, depending on how much needs to be revisited post-review.

Chuck Theiling felt the primary output of these efforts is an LTRMP report. Hard copies are more satisfying as products. Linda Leake said, "I appreciate Chuck's comment, but part of the efficiency gained 3 years ago was to cut editorial staff and production. That was a trade-off partnership agreed on we should take. Is this where we want to go with publications?" she asked.

Chuck Theiling said he felt the multi-year and the status and trends reports need a hard copy. The milestones perhaps should have a few hard copies. John Sullivan said, "It's called a printer."

STATUS AND TRENDS REPORT

The Status and Trends Report was identified in the past as a product to pull LTRMP findings together and help us sell program. UMESC removed it from the 2004 SOW because the money is not there. A number of others felt it's still an important item. Marvin Hubbell sent the comments Chuck put together-many haven't had a chance to look at it—it's an information item. With the budget issue we're at a loss. Marvin Hubbell said he had hoped 2004 would be possible. Chuck Theiling—John Sullivan passed out copies of outline. Chuck Theiling mentioned that the last one reviewed historical status and trends. "We don't need to do that now. The 10-yr reports-can quantify the baseline with parsing and tweaking of data if that's appropriate, or state 'here's the trend through time'." We need decide if we keep or change the ecosystem elements, look at the 6 categories, see if they are valid, and if so, find 6 or more individual parameters under each to show. Perhaps we could take each field station, plot a trend line, establish a desirable range, and look at the trend line to see if it is meeting it. In the last section we can recommend measures that might help us achieve our target. Monitoring and evaluation is where it kicks in on status and trends. We take those results, and ask what do we need to do to learn more? Design the focused studies to learn more. Take recommendations and apply the report card in a status and trends framework with things which people can understand that are strong ecological indicators. Parameters need to have policy and management relevance, technical merit (accurate field measurements), and practicality.

John Sullivan and Chuck Theiling discussed the pros and cons of putting off—the Status and Trends Report versus finishing it this year in time to send it to Washington. Linda Leake said Leslie fully supports it, but has no money to do it all this year. The timing issue may be the problem, John Sullivan said. Marvin Hubbell responded that as we go through budgeting process, we can take any available effort and shift it to Status and Trends Report. He said to look at the outline and send any comments to Chuck

Theiling and Linda Leake. John Sullivan suggested those of us who have time should provide some initial comments to UMESC on our overall thoughts of where this is headed. Maybe can't be funded, but it is important to get it out this year—Janet Sternberg agreed. Chuck Theiling asked if the Corps could do it in house, what would the group feel about that. Linda Leake said a discussion between Roger and Leslie could address that. John Sullivan said he had no serious problem with advancing it to get a final product done. In the interim, members could take a look and share comments with UMESC and USACE. It would be an on-going item for the next few meetings.

Janet Sternburg will represent the chair of the A-Team at next EMPCC meeting—it is the most efficient way from a cost and time standpoint, since the meeting is in St. Louis. She asked, “Are there things we’ve discussed or have not discussed today that we want to bring attention to at EMPCC? Are there ways to change the Savings and Slippage process? Chuck Theiling suggested they plan on 25% Savings and Slippage in years to come. Marvin Hubbell said Roger Perk is making that presentation at EMPCC and is offering it up as discussion item. John Sullivan will put a summary of A-Team meeting actions and recommendations together for Janet by February 23rd.

No specific additional items were brought up.

Next meeting: EMPCC meets May 20th St. Paul. We need to meet before that. The Mississippi River Research Consortium is earlier this year--April 1&2. Tom Boland suggested a conference call unless there are burning issues we need to talk about. Monday, April 19th, at 1:00 pm was penciled in as a conference call time.

Tom B. moved to adjourn at 2:20 pm, seconded by Mark Pegg. There were no Agency Reports.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Dukerschein

ANALYSIS TEAM ATTENDANCE NOVEMBER 6, 2003, ONALASKA, WI

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Phone</u>
1. Tom Boland*	IADNR	563-872-4976
2. Rob Maher*	IDNR	618-466-3451
3. T. Miller	USACE-St. Louis	314-331-8458
4. Roger Perk	USACE-Rock Island	309-794-5475
5. Marvin Hubbell	USACE-Rock Island	309-794-5428

6. Pete Redmon*	USEPA, Region 5, Chicago	312-886-6110
7. Kevin Stauffer*	MNDNR	651-345-3365
8. Dick Steinbach*	USFWS	217-224-8580
9. John Sullivan*(Chair)	WIDNR	608-785-9995
10. Jeff Houser	USGS/UMESC	608-783-7550, Est. 734
11. Valarie Barko	MDC	573-243-2659 x26
12. Sandra Brewer	USACE-Rock Island	309-794-5171
14. Terry Dukerschein	WIDNR	608-783-7550 x706
15. Matt O'Hara	INHS	309-543-6000
16. Mark Pegg	INHS	309-543-6000
17. Mike Steuck	IADNR	563-872-5495
18. Walt Popp	MNDNR	651-345-3331
19. John Chick	INHS	618-466-9690
20. Linda Leake	USGS/UMESC	608-781-6269
21. Linda Ott	USGS/UMESC	608-781-6264
22. Barry Johnson	USGS	608-781-6230
23. Pat Heglund	USGS/UMESC	608-781-6338
24. Janet Sternberg	MODOC	573-522-4115 x3372
25. Brian Ickes	USGS	608-783-7550 x69
26. Larry Robinson	USGS	608-783-7550, Ext.33
27. Jennie Sauer	USGS	608-783-7550 x64
28. Chuck Theiling	USACE-Rock Island	309-794-5636
30.		
31. Brian Gray	USGS	
32. Jeff Houser	USGS	
33. Matt O'Hara	INHS	
34. Kevin Irons	INHS	

* Indicates voting member of Analysis Team. Walter Popp represented Minnesota for Kevin Stauffer, who was absent. Fred Kollmann of NRCS was the other voting member who was absent, and he did not designate a representative.